



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,215	06/26/2003	Konstantin Zuev	ABBYY-U08	4327
7590 ABBYY Software Ltd. 11-1 Kasatkina Str. Moscow, 129301 RUSSIAN FEDERATION				
EXAMINER				
CARTER, AARON W				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2624				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/06/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/603,215

Applicant(s)

ZUEV ET AL.

Examiner

AARON W. CARTER

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally **limited to a single paragraph** on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains multiple paragraphs.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 7 and 11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim 7 and 11 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim ends with a “;” it should end with a “.”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "graphic image" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "parsing image" in line 14 renders the claim indefinite. Is the term image referring to the "form image" or the "graphic image"?

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the said graphic image identification attempt" in lines 20 and 21. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the spatial orientation model" in line 22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the preliminarily assigned direction on angle 90°" in lines 24-25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the image identification reliability level on the previous step being lower than the predetermined level thereof" in lines 26-28. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "graphic image" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "parsing image" in line 13, which renders the claim indefinite. Is the term image referring to the "form image" or the "graphic image"?

Claim 2, recites the limitation "said model" in line 19, which renders the claim indefinite. Is the term model referring to the model created in lines 4-6 or the one created in lines 11-12.

Claims 3 and 4 recite the limitation "hypotheses and the corresponding matching reliability estimation" in lines 3-4 of claim 3 and lines 2-3 of claim 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the step of the form type identification" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "the matching reliability estimation" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, the phrase "of empty region type" and "of dividing line type" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "type"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim 16 recites the limitation "the whole set of form objects" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the said special model description" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Examiner Note

5. The lack of a prior art rejection is not an indication of allowance. Due to the numerous rejections under 35 U.S.C 112 (2nd), the Examiner may be required to apply a prior art rejection upon receiving an amendment or remarks clearing up all the indefinite limitations of the claims.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 5,182,656 to Chevion et al. discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 5,416,849 to Huang discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 5,235,654 to Anderson et al. discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 5,793,887 to Zlotnick discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 6,778,703 to Zlotnick discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

US 2002/0106128 to Zlotnick discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 6,640,009 to Zlotnick discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 6,760,490 to Zlotnick discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 5,257,328 to Shimizu discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 5,025,484 to Yamanari et al. discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

USPN 5,191,525 to LeBrun et al. discloses a process of analyzing machine-readable form images.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON W. CARTER whose telephone number is (571)272-7445. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 4:30 am (Mon. - Fri.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron W Carter/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624